UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Do Let Us Try to Think Straight - - - - - - - - - *Richard B. Gregg*

Where World Government Might Start - - - - - - - - - *William B. Lloyd, Jr.*

France and Civil Liberties - *Pierre Gordon*

When Jew and Christian Meet - - - - - - - - - - - *Robert Whitaker*

The Old Trade Routes - - - - - - - - - - *Robert Scott Kellerman*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 8

Chicago, June 17, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 115
Jottings—J. H. H. 118
ARTICLES—
Do Let Us Try to Think Straight—RICHARD B. GREGG 118
Where World Government Might Start—WILLIAM B. LLOYD, JR. 120
France and Civil Liberties—PIERRE GORDON 121
When Jew and Christian Meet—ROBERT WHITAKER 123
The Old Trade Routes—ROBERT SCOTT KELLERMAN 124
On the Pacifist Front—XVI 125
POETRY—
Soldier Dead—MARGARET LATHROP LAW 117
The Voices—GEOFFREY JOHNSON 126
THE STUDY TABLE—
A Vivid Defense of Democracy—JAMES M. YARD 127
America's Unforgettable Philosopher—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 127
CORRESPONDENCE—
The Lunch-Counter Girl—ETHEL G. ROCKWELL 128
A Parable for These Times—HENRIETTA POSNER 128
THE FIELD—
Address Delivered at the 18th Annual Service of Remembrance for Heroes of Social Construction, Sunday, June 2, 1940—E. H. OXLEY 114
Keep Out of This War 128

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Address Delivered at the 18th Annual Service of Remembrance for Heroes of Social Construction, Sunday, June 2, 1940

By E. H. OXLEY*

With the noise of battle raging furiously in the greater part of the Old World, with bombs wreaking vengeance on the innocent and the helpless, with the theatre of war extending on land, on sea, under the waters and in the air, we have met together in the German Protestant Cemetery in an atmosphere of grim irony to firmly reassert, irrespective of race or the variety of our religious experiences, our undying and united faith in the simple, homespun virtues of our common heritage—virtues that find expression in home and factory, in mine and workshop, in basement and skyscraper, in the throes of childbirth, in laboratory and hospital, in all the various common ministries of life.

We dare to believe that here lies as treasured dust of bygone piety, courage, and devotion to human welfare as was ever enshrined in consecrated urn or awe-inspiring tomb of the soldier who perished on the battlefield of war.

Let no word here be spoken, save in praise and thanksgiving for those brave men, living and dead, who rise in defense of the fatherland against all wars of ruthless aggression, but let us also remember that wars have never settled permanently any social problem and never will. We must inevitably find recourse to God—symbol of those qualities of righteousness, justice and truth, sacrifice and love, which are the abiding possession of a world at peace.

It is the extreme glorification of the soldier on the battlefield with the relative depreciation of those in the pursuits of peace that is bringing our civilization to the very brink of universal ruin.

The hour of this world's travail has struck. The past seven years, neo-paganism has deified the power of armed might; during this same period moral forces of the world have laid emphasis on the power of peace. Who will record the victory?

However, catching a fresh glimpse of the glory and justice of Eternal Love, we, at least, believe that what the great philosopher, William James, called "the moral equivalent of war" is found and ought to be recognized in butler and baker, in cook and chauffeur, in porter and bus boy, in policeman and fireman, in nurse and physician, in explorer and missionary, in parent and teacher, in pastor and friend. To these heroes of social construction, we pay just tribute today.

If I were to select a text from Holy Scripture to reinforce what I have tried feebly to express to you, I would go to the ancient prophecy of Israel, and read from the First Book of Samuel, the 30th chapter and the 24th verse: "As his part is that goeth down to the battle, so is his that tarrieth by the stuff: they shall share alike!"

The scene referred to in this text shows

(*Continued on page* 128)

*Rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, June 17, 1940 No. 8

HYMN

Thou God of all, whose spirit moves
From pole to silent pole;
Whose purpose binds the starry spheres
In one stupendous whole;
Whose life, like light, is freely poured
On all men 'neath the sun;
To Thee we lift our hearts, and pray
That Thou wilt make us one.

One in the patient company
Of those who heed Thy will,
And steadfastly pursue the way
Of Thy commandments still;
One in the holy fellowship
Of those who challenge wrong,
And lift the spirit's sword to shield
The weak against the strong.

One in the truth that makes men free,
The faith that makes men brave;
One in the love that suffers long
To seek, and serve, and save;
One in the vision of Thy peace,
The kingdom yet to be—
When Thou shalt be the God of all,
And all be one in Thee.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

FUTILITY

The tragedy of the European war, as of all wars, is its futility. Nothing gained by all this fighting, and dying, and destroying, even though the Allies win after a struggle that will bleed them white for a hundred years. Not unless victory is followed by a far-visioned and sacrificial peace such as never yet has sprung from the hatreds and vengeances of triumphant war! Grant that Hitler is at last destroyed in just the way now proclaimed by England and France as the object of this fight! What more permanent and beneficent would be accomplished than by the destruction of the Kaiser years ago? Writing on this very subject in his May 25th *Saturday Evening Post* article on "Too Many Germans," Mr. Wallace R. Deuel says:

> They [the nations] enter major wars because they think they have to do so to keep or to acquire the means of maintaining their own national existences on a physical and moral level essential to their self-respect. The essential elements of conflict in the present war are precisely these. France and England have had the means of maintaining their national existences on this level and are determined to keep them. Germany has lacked them and is determined to get them. France and England would rather fight than give them up. Germany would rather fight than go without them.

Then Mr. Deuel concludes:

> Hitlerism is the expression of Germany's determination . . . to fight rather than continue to go without world power and its privileges. So long as the basic elements of Germany's strength remain unchanged and so long as Europe tries to go on living under its present political system, there will continue to be wars on this same essential issue. The destruction of Hitlerism will accomplish little of lasting value unless and until a great many other things are destroyed, too.

What can alone save Europe, and perhaps the world, says Mr. Deuel, is the devising of "a constitution [for Europe] which takes adequate account of the German realities." But the state of mind that can conceive and achieve such a reordering of international society is just the state of mind which is consumed in the fears and hates of war. Hence—the futility of war?

THE MANIA OF WAR

The country is going mad. As the European war deepens in horror, the American people go crazier and crazier in unworthy fears and extravagant responses to these fears. Here are some of the things that have been happening: the President has called for 50,000 planes to protect Omaha and points west from bombardment. * * * The National Legion of Mothers of America has announced plans for teaching the Legion's members how to shoot a rifle in defense against parachute troops invading the United States. Weekly shooting practice will supplant teas and bridges. * * * Dean Christian Gauss, of Princeton University, who signed a petition of the American Association of Scientific Workers urging that the United States remain at peace, announced a few days later that "he had changed his mind." * * * Newbold Morris, President of the New York City Council, has written the President asking that facilities for military training be provided for all men between the ages of 25 and 45. * * * At a meeting of the Women's National Farm and Garden Association, the Honorary President, Mrs. Francis King, declared that America's farm women are ready now to train "farmerettes" for service on the home front in case of war. * * * Ex.-Asst.-Secretary of the Navy, Henry Breckinridge, has called for an immediate declaration of war against Germany. * * * The New York State Society of Professional Engineers has unanimously approved action to compile a detailed list of all the Society's members, so that their services "may be promptly available in any emergency for the defense of the United States government." * * * A statement by Governor Landon in opposition to a third term was hotly denounced as "traitorous." * * * Congress has passed a law providing for the finger-printing and registration of aliens.

* * * California has organized a body of patriots called the "Erase the Fifth Column, Inc." * * * A citizen has been reported shot as a suspected German parachutist. * * * Colonel Lindbergh, opposing America's entrance into the war and deploring idle "chatter" about the country's perils, was hotly derided as a Nazi and "a friend of Hitler." * * * The Washington police, warned by telephone of a Fifth Column conspiracy to blow up government buildings, raided a peaceful home occupied by perfectly innocent people. * * * Local offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in New York have been swamped for days with reports of spies, foreign agents, and Fifth Columnists. * * * "Everybody with a pet scheme may now be expected to hook it on to national defense, because 'the nation is in danger' from something or other. . . . The hysteria is on." (John T. Flynn). It is indeed! Mad, *mad*—and nothing to do about it.

THE HOSTS OF THE DYING

The sheer physical task of keeping people alive is going to be enough to engage the energies of the United States for a long time to come. Spending billions of dollars for preparedness seems to us like a man's spending his money for rifles and revolvers when his neighbors are starving, their houses burning down, and their families scattered and lost. At this moment the refugee problem is so colossal as to stagger the imagination. Apparently several millions of helpless folk have been driven out of Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and northern France, and now depend for survival upon charity which must come to them from beyond the seas if it is to come to them at all. Add to these miserables the almost forgotten millions in Poland, Finland, and Norway, and you have a food, clothing, and shelter problem beyond anything that man has known in modern times. And this problem will grow rather than diminish through the dreadful months ahead. Then, with the winter, will come horror untold. As the fighting slackens in the rain and cold, two spectres will appear in the trail of war—starvation and pestilence. The whole continent of Europe, west of Russia, will be stricken with hunger, as nations absorbed in war and preparedness for war have been unable to provide adequate subsistence for their peoples. Already populations numbering scores of millions—in France, Germany, Italy, the Balkans, the conquered countries—are on a semi-starvation diet. A few months more, with lands laid waste, crops unplanted or ungathered, imports gone, factories turned to the making of munitions and guns, and the gaunt ghost of starvation itself will stand everywhere on the thresholds of men's homes. And side by side with starvation will stand pestilence. For as men starve, they will sicken; the unmentionable sanitary conditions of the fighting will spread contagion; and disease will be all abroad. And it is in this hour, with friend and foe, Germany and the Allies, alike perishing, that America chooses to arm herself to the teeth! A dying Europe is before us—a continent in the throes of suicide—and hundreds of millions of innocent common people are near to death. Shall we save them, as we alone can save them—or shall we spend our selfish wealth upon ourselves?

THE PLIGHT OF RELIGION

What is happening, and will continue to happen in increasing ratio, to religion and the churches in this world we live in, is indicated by statements issuing from current religious conferences. Here, for example, is a report submitted to the recent annual convention of the United Lutheran Synod of New York. It is estimated, according to this report, that at least half the churches in Germany are not in use at the present time. Most of the Lutheran churches in Norway and Poland are either closed or without pastors. The latest report from Finland, where 96 per cent of the people are Lutherans, is to the effect that a single Helsinki church was the only one spared by the ravages of the Russian invasion. What has happened to the Catholic churches of Poland, Belgium, and northern France may better be imagined than described. The plight of the Protestants in conquered Holland may well match that of the Protestants in the Reich. At the Northern Baptist Convention in Atlantic City, the President of the Convention referred to the fearful financial ravages certain to fall on the churches as the result of war and the lowered standards of living incident to war. He forecast in this country, whether we actually take up arms or not, a decline in income which would certainly upset all existing budgets and might even threaten the continuance of a paid ministry. He called upon the churches to prepare immediately for the approaching change. More serious than churches and finances is the whole question of morale—the life of religion itself as an ethical and spiritual influence in the lives of men. The last war sapped the vitality of religion to a degree which left the world desolate of idealism in the post-war period. What this war will do in its combined material and spiritual damage is terrible to contemplate. What wonder that the Lutheran Synod found itself thinking of the Thirty Years War when "the population dropped in Germany from thirty to six millions on account of religious persecutions." This horror was survived, and can be survived again, declared the Synod, in unconquerable faith. "We must not despair, for religion cannot die."

COMMUNIST CONFUSION

How the Communist issue is bedevilling the work of liberal progress and reform in this country is clearly shown by a report issued in connection with a survey of "Stalin Outposts in the United States." This report follows:

> The original Communist-dominated organization was the *Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy*. There followed *The North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy*. In 1938 the two were merged and renamed *Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democ-*

racy, into which was later incorporated *The American Friends of Spanish Democracy.* After the civil war had ended, in April, 1939, a new organization was formed, *The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign,* from which Socialist and Communist Party representatives were asked to drop out. A crisis was precipitated within the organization in March, 1940, when unauthorized statements were issued from the *Campaign's* offices and when, to protest a forged government "decree," Communist members ordered the picketing of the French Consulate. The chairman, Francis J. McConnell, and the secretary, Herman F. Reissig, dissociated the *Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign* from all responsibility for the demonstration and wrested the national body from control of the Communists. The New York section, however, remained in Communist hands and was temporarily called *The Emergency Conference to Save Spanish Refugees.* Its "permanent" name is now *The North American Spanish Aid Committee.* Overnight there has sprung up *Dorothy Parker's Spanish Children's Relief Fund,* with headquarters in the offices of *The North American Spanish Aid Committee.*

If the Communist Party went about its business, doing its appointed work, nobody would complain. The Communists have an inalienable constitutional right to organize their own political activities, hold their own meetings, and in general advance their own cause. But they are not willing thus to do their own job, and leave other people alone. On the contrary, they make it their deliberate policy to invade reform societies, relief organizations, liberal groups, trade unions, forums, and even churches, there gain control, and then use the power thus secured for their own partisan purpose. In pursuit of this "Trojan Horse" policy, they resort to all manner of lies, deceptions, camouflages, and conspiracies. They work persistently under cover of false names and hidden designs, and constantly misappropriate funds to party uses. In recent years, organization after organization has been split and in many cases captured by this nefarious activity of dishonest and unscrupulous radicals. Then, when these organizations have tried in decency to rid themselves of their betrayers, they have been accused of red-baiting, purging, and unAmerican practices generally. What is involved here is liberty to serve one's own cause without interference or betrayal. This issue will be vindicated, whatever the cost.

THIS RADIO MESS

We know of no more illuminating experience than to take a good radio and, at a given moment, turn the dial slowly but steadily from left to right. In the course of the journey over the dial-face, a series of stations will be tuned in long enough to detect the nature of their programs. It seems to make no difference what the hour and minute may be—at any given instant, the majority of the stations are proclaiming the surpassing merits of a new baking powder, or the mild, cool flavor of a popular cigarette, or the miraculous qualities of some beer or whisky. In other words, the chief burden of the air is advertising. In between, as the dial moves, you hear the wandering strains of some organ killing time, or the hoarse crooning of some vocalist who croons because he (or she) cannot sing, or the creaks and squeaks of some jazz-band from the night-club jungle, or the breathless inanities of some fifteen-minute detective drama, or the colloquial ramblings of some serial which proves that, on the air waves at least, nature no longer abhors a vacuum. Nowadays there come the indispensable news reports of the European war, and on occasion the strains of a symphony orchestra, or the strong voice of some trained singer or earnest speaker, to prove that the radio is not yet one hundred percent a waste of time and attention. But, in the turning of the dial, the general effect is one of such appalling vulgarity and emptiness as to defy description. This is what man has done with the most marvellous invention of the age! This is the level on which moves most easily and happily the so-called intelligence of the race! But be not too quick in judgment! How many of the radio public have anything to say about programs? Does a popularity vote mean anything more than that, when challenged to choose between a wizened apple, sour bread, and sawdust for our meal, we choose the wizened apple? Just as it has always been silly to say that a newspaper publishes what the public wants, so is it equally silly to say that a radio broadcasts what the public wants. The poor public takes what it can get! Does anyone suppose, for example, that radio listeners want to listen to this intolerable and sickening advertising—that they would not silence every last vestige of it if they had the chance? Then why are we given this advertising? Because advertising brings in money, for the making of which the radio stations alone exist. Our radios, in other words, just like our newspapers, are commercial, not cultural, institutions. They exist not to please, or satisfy, or educate people—but *to sell goods.* And so, as the price of getting any information, entertainment, or inspiration at all, we have to plunge ourselves into a perfect welter of disgust, and thank heaven if we survive. We count the radio the supreme horror of our age. And it should be the supreme blessing.

Soldier Dead

When rich delight is flung
In scattered crocus gold
And pagan joy is rung
As bell-like buds unfold,

They'll lie, uncannily still,
In eternity's lonely bed,
Forever denied our thrill
Of rising when dawn is red.

They're destined never to hear
The whirr of nesters' wings.
Into the earth muffled ear
No songster will ever sing.

May April petal shower
Contrive a tender quilt
And beauty's renewal power
Whiten their slaughterers' guilt.

MARGARET LATHROP LAW.

Jottings

It was the English who invented tanks in the last war. It is tanks, built on new and prodigious lines, which have been smashing the English lines in this war. See Matthew 26:52.

We find in the May issue of the *Christian Pacifist* (London) a report from the missionary field:

> The Pacific people are asking many questions about the so-called Christian West now at war. In Papua the advent of the Church has meant the disappearance of cannibalism and head-hunting. Why, one Papuan asked, has it not the same effect in Europe?

A scientific inventor has produced an explosive which is 100 times more powerful than T. N. T. If there is any one thing in particular which the world would seem not to need at just this moment, it is a new explosive. Isn't T. N. T. adequate to destroy civilization?

Some day we propose to make a collection of definitions of war. The latest we have found in Edward Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* War, says the great historian, is *"the art of destroying the human species."*

The American Psychopathological Association has telegraphed the President urging "the imperative necessity of speeding all means of defense and preparatory mobilization of all social, industrial and financial resources and manpower."

Decidedly psychopathological, say we!

With this issue, "Jottings" leaves the columns of this paper for its annual vacation. The department will reappear in the first issue for October, the 7th.

J. H. H.

Do Let Us Try to Think Straight

RICHARD B. GREGG

Please can we not keep just a little memory and perspective?

When excited people assert that if the Nazis win this war, the world is in for at least a century of totalitarian slavery, why not remember what happened after the last great military victory in 1918? The victorious Allies disarmed Germany completely, occupied the Ruhr industrial area for months, took away physical assets, impoverished her with enormous indemnities, hampered her trade, created an encircling ring of hostile states around her, especially fortified and supported Czechoslovakia on her flank, dismembered Austria, tried their utmost to render Germany impotent. Within fifteen years the effort had failed. And now after twenty-two years maybe the wheel has nearly turned full circle.

Very well; if Germany wins and imposes ruthless and crushing terms on the Allies or even on the rest of the world, will those terms last longer than fifteen years? Napoleon's regime also lasted only about fifteen years, and social processes since his day have greatly speeded up. Even though Russia, Italy and Japan join Germany and share the spoils, would they not fall out amongst themselves, as did the Allies? Assuredly there will be great change, great suffering, and loss of liberty, but any enslavement would not last even a half-generation.

Consider the fear that victorious Nazis would indoctrinate the youth of all the conquered nations. The Nazis did it with their own youth because those children had grown up in the same atmosphere as their leaders, and would take ideas from those who expressed their own feelings. But does anyone really think that Nazi doctrines are being or will be absorbed by an effective plurality of the children of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Scandinavia, or Holland, or that Japanese culture is flowering amongst the youth of Korea or the occupied districts of China? No, the culture of harsh alien conquerors is not acceptable to the rising generation of conquered nations. That fact of history is constantly repeated. Remember how Bohemian culture endured through centuries of alien rule. And if you say that modern propaganda and mass psychology are compelling, underdogs also will find ways to use the new knowledge.

When people talk about "defending our country," how many of them know exactly what they mean? By that phrase do they mean keeping intact our political boundaries, our political institutions, our economic organizations, our material equipment for living, our social mores, our liberties, our entire cultural status, or a special combination of some of these? Since modern science and technology create rapid changes which soon affect all areas of life, we cannot, if we retain science, possibly keep everything intact. If so, what do we value most? What do we most desire to keep?

A little thought will persuade most people that the things the majority of us value most are the result of slow and peaceful growth, and are usually intangible and rather subtle. Things like fine personal relationships; civil, economic, and religious freedoms; science, art, music, poetry, high standards of public morality, a sense of security and enduring order. These things require careful thought, delicate discrimination, patience, tolerance, mutual trust, and time.

If we go in for military defense, we go in for indignation, resentment, anger, fear, hatred, and bitterness, all on a large scale. In that atmosphere we drop toward the animal level, especially in group relations. In such conditions we cannot think deeply or judge wisely, and we cannot promote the things we most value. The violence does not even protect them, for it decreases our capacity to appreciate as well as to create. And the potential fine minds and hearts of the oncoming generation get slaughtered, so civilization is impoverished for a long time. So how and what does modern violence defend?

The idea of national defense by arms is ancient, and, like most ancient things, much of it is anachronism. The world in which the idea of such defense grew up and acquired vigorous maturity was a world in which wealth was chiefly tangible and mobile, and therefore could be captured and carried off. It was a world where tribes and nations were separated and independent, culturally and economically as well as politically. Therefore one nation could rob and injure another without repercussions that were too swift or too unpleasant. Within each such nation the villages were largely autonomous and the web of national economic life was loose. So destruction or injury of one region did not too greatly harm the others. Economy was predominantly agricultural. In that world the armies were small, professional, and lived mostly off the territory in which they were fighting. These conditions constitute the assumption supporting the idea and sentiments of national defense. The complex assumption is usually unconscious.

The actual present world is very different. It is a world based on modern science, technology, and finance. By these instrumentalities the nations are now all in close contact with one another. Political boundaries are increasingly arbitrary, and act less and less as cultural divisions. The web of commerce, finance, scientific and technological knowledge is close and finely woven. War is totalitarian. Hence, an injury to one nation is an injury to all, including the nation which launches it. Every attack is a boomerang, and soon zooms back upon its author. The violation of Belgium by Germany in 1914, for example, injured Germany severely in the subsequent years. The nine-month blockade of Germany by the British navy *after* the "peace" of 1918 was signed, the enormous reparations, the humiliations and impoverishment inflicted on the German peoples, her exclusion from the League for years—all these are now coming home to roost on the Allies.

In fact, modern science and technology at last are compelling us to see that the differences and separations between groups of the human species are not as important or enduring as the similarities and unities. The human species is really an organic unity. Strong evidence of this is offered by biology, physiology, anatomy, psychology, anthropology, ethnology, linguistics, history, comparative religion, and many other studies.

The idea of military defense of the nation thus rests upon an assumption which no longer accords with the facts. The trouble with the militarists arises not so much out of their logic as out of their assumptions, not only their assumption relating to defense but also their assumption about the nature of man. National action based upon false assumptions is sure to injure us all gravely, and also the things we most value.

Maybe you will reply that though all this is logically plausible, it does not shelter us from bombs dropping from hostile airplanes.

The reply would be two-fold. First, insofar as we assisted or condoned the violation of group morality against Germany, Italy, Russia and Japan during the last twenty-six years or so, we will have to pay a large penalty. Much of the effort of military defense in most nations is an attempt to avoid paying the bill for national sins against other nations. The attempt is futile. We will suffer for those mistakes, whether by bombs or impoverishment or both. We have already been suffering. Let us be honest with ourselves and with others, and stop trying to dodge payment of the moral debts we have incurred.

Moral law is just as inexorable as the law of gravitation or any other physical law. It is only that we seem to be too immature to see it, and perhaps a little afraid to face it, especially in international affairs.

When people protest that it is unjust for innocent persons to suffer for the sins of their governments or for those of other governments, the answer is that if the unity of the human race is actually deeper and more important than its diversities, the innocent must necessarily suffer for the sins of the guilty, and the guilty also suffer. As a matter of history, it has always been so. Just as in an acknowledged organic unity such as the body of an individual person, if one part becomes infected, all other parts suffer from the poison. The healthy innocent members do not become indignant at the injustice of the suffering imposed upon them. Every member tries to help all the others all the time. That is one implication of organic unity. The cry of indignation at injustice arises from the mistaken idea that the differences between members of the human species are deeper and more important than the similarities and unities. At a superficial level the injustices are undeniable, but to get indignant at them is a mistake.

All this is not iridescent, impossible, Sunday School idealism. It is cool science. The majority of people will not yet accept it. The momentum of habitual ideas and sentiments will prevail for a while. But it is not preposterous to hope that some of the people who call themselves educated and realistic thinkers can adjust themselves thoroughly to the new situation.

The second part of the answer is more hopeful. True, the breaking of moral law by the nations hurts us as surely as disregard of the law of gravitation gives us a bump. The immense power put into men's hands by modern science is making that dramatically clear. But just as the scientific assumption of an underlying unity of Nature and of physical laws and the rigorous following out of that assumption into every department of science have given us marvelous advances, so the assumption of human unity and the rigorous and persistent following of the logic of this assumption in every direction would yield still richer rewards. That is what will finally prevent bombs from raining down on us, and it is the only way.

If a nation, after having violated moral laws, realizes the mistake, turns around and begins to live with increasing thoroughness in accordance with moral law, and persists therein, the bill for its past mistakes is promptly discounted, and eventually does not have to be paid in full. That is a pleasant fact about human nature and human unity.

This is not what is often smugly called "being good." It is merely trying to think straight and act consistently, honestly, and with the courage of our assumptions and thinking. The action will be very slow and difficult, but do let us at least get our assumptions and thinking straight.

I do not believe that many people will agree, or even if they did give intellectual assent, would now let such ideas control their feelings or action. But without some such basis realized and adhered to by a number of leaders, I do not see how we can develop the domestic and international psychiatrists necessary to cure us of our insanity. Despite the mass hysteria and because of it, are not such ideas worth trying to spread?

Where World Government Might Start

WILLIAM B. LLOYD, JR.

"But you cannot be isolationist and internationalist at one and the same time." This is the most insistent complaint that the Campaign for World Government receives from persons to whom the organization's platform is presented.

Looking back at the leaflet describing objectives of the Campaign, one puzzled citizen referred to the two Congressional resolutions which this movement supports. Senate Resolution 191 by Senator Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado urges the President to call a conference of neutral nations to bring about an immediate armistice; House Concurrent Resolution 27 by Congressman Jerry Voorhis of California requests him to call a world convention for drafting the constitution for an "all-inclusive, democratic, non-military federation of nations."

According to the nicely staked-out compartments of the American peace movement, one of these resolutions is on the "neutrality" side of the fence, and the other on the "interventionist" side. Together, they have been branded "utopian" by the kind of listener who would have us jump right into the war, or else forget all about what is being done—or not being done—by the ambassadors whose salaries are paid by the American taxpayer.

Others have suggested that this double-edged program is unfriendly to the British "war effort"—though hundreds of groups in Great Britain have resolved, since the beginning of the war, that it should be immediately stopped. Professors and other intellectual leaders in England are busy forming their ideas of "federal union," "federation of Europe," and other proposals—all of which must go through the hopper of a constitutional convention if they are ever to partake of living reality. These resolutions actually point in the same direction as a large sector of British opinion today.

The Senate resolution offers a solution to the problem of securing a peace before Europe is totally eclipsed under the impact of total war. A long-range solution—but one toward which the first step must be taken immediately—is provided in the resolution of Congressman Voorhis.

"All-inclusive" in the wording of his resolution refers, of course, to the scope of the invitations which should go out for the constitutional convention. If some invitations are not accepted it will, of course, be necessary for a quorum to go ahead. If any rulers choose to abstain, let the blame for their country's exclusion be on their own heads, not on the outside world. It is necessary to make a practical start, and this means at least a discreet bow toward the social amenities of diplomacy. And in that field, it is obvious that every sovereign state not included in the invitation to help found the new world organization would be encouraged to interpret the exclusion as a positive declaration of the inferiority, not only of the ruler, but also of the people of that nation. Although emphasizing ideological differences may be a good way to get people "fighting mad," it is hardly a wise preparation for a world conference.

"Democratic" refers to the structure of the proposed world federation itself. Nations would be free to choose their own brand of economic and political salvation for internal consumption.

"Non-military" refers to the absence of any international army or navy capable of warlike invasion of member nations. How the forefathers of the United States Constitution solved the knotty question of federal law within sovereign states was explained in the following words written by James Madison to Thomas Jefferson shortly after the Convention:

> A *voluntary* observance of the federal law by all the members could never be hoped for. A *compulsive* one could evidently never be reduced to practice, and if it could, involved equal calamities to the innocent and the guilty, the necessity of a military force both obnoxious and dangerous, and in general a scene resembling much more a civil war than the administration of a regular government.
>
> Hence was embraced the alternative of a Government, which instead of operating on the States, should operate without their intervention on the *individuals* composing them.

The United States has found it a lot more practical and less expensive to entrust enforcement of the kidnapping, bankruptcy, and other federal laws to U. S. Marshals and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, than to send the U. S. Army. Likewise world federal law could be enforced on individuals by world federal agents.

It is an interesting commentary on the League of Nations that in the Manchurian crisis it was compelled to depend for current information on the British and French diplomatic services. The idea suggests itself that certain League decisions might have been different had the League maintained its own independent observers on the spot. No world organization can begin to call itself a government until it has independent and separate contacts directly with individuals.

The Campaign for World Government opened headquarters at 166 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, on Armistice Day, 1939, but its official history goes back to December, 1937, when it was launched by Mme. Rosika Schwimmer, first woman ambassador and leader of many peace campaigns, and Lola Maverick Lloyd, one of the founders of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. The writer joined as full-time American director in the spring of 1938. Sponsors include Carleton Washburne, originator of the well-known Winnetka plan of elementary school education, Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, Dr. Anton J. Carlson, University of Chicago physiologist, Dr. Alice Paul, woman's rights leader, Miss Charlotte Carr, head resident of Hull House, and Harry Elmer Barnes.

First milestone in the legislative campaign was passed in the summer of 1938 with the introduction into the New York State Constitutional Convention of a memorial urging the President to call a world constitutional convention. In the following April, a similar resolution was introduced in the Wisconsin legislature, and was reported on favorably by unanimous vote of the State Affairs Committee. The present Voorhis resolution was introduced in June, 1939.

Along with legislative action, and as a stimulus to such progress, the Campaign plans unofficial gatherings of constitutional experts on a local, national, and world scale to draw up an unofficial world constitutional convention.

Leaders of the Campaign are apt to refer doubters to real life illustrations: to a large extent peace is simply the problem of choosing the right machinery for solving issues without violent conflict—just as a work-

man must choose the right tool to do a job. World problems require world federation, just as national problems require a national federal government.

When our ancestors stumbled on the device of counting noses on a question dividing families or tribes, rather than fighting it out, it was first frowned on as "impractical." Nevertheless, this device of democracy has worked out reasonably well, by and large, and, apart from its practicability, has come to be recognized as the only political system which preserves the dignity and moral rights of the individual. It must now be applied to the world community brought into being by steam-power, electricity, airplane and radio—or some military tyranny will rule the world. Why not just skip the war and draft a broader system of counting noses, instead?

So the Campaign for World Government goes on sawing wood, convinced that George Washington was right when he urged the delegates to the United States Constitutional Convention: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

France and Civil Liberties*

PIERRE GORDON

Has France lost all of its democracy? You read that statement often in the Left press. Has it, on the contrary, maintained an almost pure democracy even during the war? You might think so if you believed everything the Rightist editors told you. What are the facts? What is the nature of the laws regarding civil liberty? What is the attitude of the people? These questions are important; for what happens in France may be a measure of what the war will do to much of Europe.

When the war broke out, placing France in a state of siege, the military tribunals, whose power immediately accrued to them, and the civil courts of justice were empowered by certain articles of the law and legislative texts with great authority to be used against delinquencies which threatened the security of the state or gave voice to anti-militarist propaganda. A decree was added on August 28, authorizing the repression of tracts—either if distributed or merely possessed—that were deemed to endanger French safety.

A series of similar decrees have been published since then in the *Journal Officiel,* reinforcing the government's legal means of repression.

On September 1 a decree was promulgated which was intended to halt the "publication of information of a nature which would exert a harmful influence on the spirit of the army and the population." That is how the text expresses it; the punishments may vary from one to ten years' imprisonment and from a fine of 1,000 to 10,000 francs. "It has appeared necessary to meet the present need by legal provisions similar to those of the law of August 5, 1914, on the repressions of indiscretions of the press in time of war, a law which has passed out of application."

Only information was aimed at in this September 1 decree. But on November 3 a new decree was put through to prevent oral or written expression which might be detrimental to the spirit of the people or damaging to the national defense.

This decree was the start of numerous sentences. Censorship was established, especially over words spoken in public. The press was not so seriously affected in general as the periodicals of peace and liberal movements. The French, accustomed as they are to freedom of speech, abandon only with great reluctance their right to say what they think, good and loud. So many prisoners came before the court accused of having said things in cafes and on the streets "of a nature to exert a harmful influence on the spirit of the population and the army," that even the press became full of discreetly-worded and poorly-displayed accounts of these trials. Most of these explosive people were not pacifists, revolutionaries, nor even excessively disgruntled. They were grumblers, talkative, disturbed by the shock of the war to their normal lives and ready to blow off steam about it. Many, in order to escape punishment, contended that they had been drinking too much. A number, nevertheless, were condemned to several years' imprisonment.

The decree proved in practice rather difficult to apply. Several cases having come up before a higher court were there dismissed. "Seditious speech," it seemed, did not include mere "knocking," but it might cover the imparting of information that would help the foes of France. Hence a new decree was added to all the rest. On January 25 it was made clear to the already decree-burdened people of the Republic that, for speeches or conversations, slogans, or menacing writings, printed matter or posters without an informative character but nevertheless with a tendency to aid the undertakings of a foreign power against France, the penalty might vary from a fine of 50 to 5,000 francs, and from one month to two years behind the bars.

There was reaction against this measure, as might have been expected. Who could say exactly what harmed the people or the army, and what did not? The decree had to be backed up by an official explanation. This said:

> The decree of September 1, 1939, suppressing the publication of information tending to exert a harmful influence on the spirit of the army and the population, only after interpretations placed upon it by certain recent court actions, may now be extended to cover certain seditious statements of a purely subjective nature, which, without being the objective statement of a precise fact, and without being themselves acts harmful to national defense, are nonetheless liable to exert a harmful influence on the morale of the population and the army, and to encourage the enemy's plans.
>
> It is necessary to punish such statements, which appear to be the expression of a personal opinion, and which are in reality watchwords of enemy propaganda; and which, publicly voiced, demonstrate the clearly-defined intention of their author to hurt national defense by attacking the morale of the people and the military forces.

This explanation hardly explained. It left holes wide enough for any martinet or superpatriot to push through into prison anyone uttering statements that could be interpreted by narrow or emotional natures as food for enemy tables. There was an uproar, as much as there may ever be in a censored press, in a multitude of papers. Cartoonists grew sarcastic about the differ-

*This survey of conditions in wartime France is written by an experienced and well-known French journalist under a pen name, and is released through the *Nofrontier News Service.—Editor.*

ence between "subjective" and "objective" sedition. The Left press in particular, including such papers as *Le Populaire, La Lumière, l'Oeuvre,* denounced the law without sparing too much vehemence. Large sections of their editorials were sliced out, and sometimes complete editorials in a block. It was feared by every thoughtful journalist that the vagueness about "subjectively seditious statements" might lead to regrettable abuses. The Bureau of the Parisian Press Syndicate, which is composed of the editors of the big newspapers, demanded clarification of this whole matter. They addressed a stiff interrogation to M. Georges Bonnet, Minister of Justice, who replied that in no case could there be court action resulting from the writing of an article suppressed by the censor. That gave a certain protection to editors of the regular press, but not of course to distributors and writers of underground leaflets, such as pacifist or radical labor organizations. It produced a situation better than was feared, but one falling miles short of the freedom allowed in Great Britain.

Another decree has aroused anxiety not only in the Left papers but in conservative circles also. It was immediately labelled the "suspects" law. This decree of November 18 aims at individuals dangerous to national defense or public security. Persons under suspicion may be removed by the military authorities from their residence and even be kept at a center designated by the Minister of National Defense and the Minister of the Interior. All this at a decision of the Prefect (the government's representative in each department or state). A suspect may also be removed, as a preventive measure, to an enforced place of residence, or to the specially organized "work corps."

As soon as this decree appeared it was criticized by Leon Blum, leader of the Socialist Party, in *Le Populaire.* But the way in which the censorship works is shown by the fact that this article, by a former Premier, was suppressed in entirety. The censor likewise cut out the protest of the weekly, *La Lumière,* but allowed the following remark to get by in the semi-official and conservative *Temps*: "A new text is not superfluous provided it is enforced with discrimination and without an arbitrary spirit." M. Colrat, too, wrote in the *Excelsior*: "It is certain that such power is discretionary and that all discretionary power must be wielded with discretion; that is to say, with discrimination. It remains to be seen whether the Prefects are capable of exercising their mandate as judges in such a sense."

The Commission of Civil and Criminal Legislation of the Chamber of Deputies was stirred. It sent a delegation to the Minister of the Interior, which expressed its unwillingness to agree that at a simple decision of a Prefect, without any guaranty of impartial judgment, without any right of defense whatever there could be effected the internment of any French citizen in a "center"—or in more honest language a concentration camp —or the change of his residence, or that he be subjected to forced labor. On the 29th of November a new decree substantially modifying the autocratic suspect law was put through. But even this was too strong for the Commission, and it has decided to present to the government a demand that both these decrees should be abolished.

Of course, many special decree laws have been directed at the Communist Party alone. On September 26 the party was officially outlawed, and so were numerous groups loosely or closely tied up with it. All publications which spread the instructions or attitudes of the Third International (Communist) were equally put out of business. The Communist movement lost its property, which was confiscated. The Friends of the Soviet Union, the League for Peace and Liberty, the Union of Women Against War, and many similar bodies, which had been working more or less with a certain degree of Communist collaboration, were eradicated. Communists still distributing tracts are almost weekly the recipients of severe sentences passed by the courts.

More significantly, the question arose, what to do with the deputies elected on the Communist ticket at a time when France was negotiating for the sort of pact with Stalin that Hitler eventually signed instead? At first, many of the Communist deputies sought to establish a new party, the Workers' and Peasants' parliamentary group. But this too was seen as a device, and was disbanded. Out of the 74 deputies who represented the Communist Party before the war, about 20, at different dates, condemned the Hitler-Stalin pact and broke off all ties with Communism. By vote of the Chamber, all deputies who had not renounced their allegiance to the Communist movement before October 25 were denied their rights in Parliament; some delayed too long, but a considerable number forthrightly denounced the new Russian "line."

In several working-class districts, the Communists held the municipal administration in their own hands. But all municipal councils which had a Communist majority were dissolved, and the mayors and deputy officers replaced by government officials. The General Councillors (elected members of the department assemblies), the municipal councillors, the Communist delegates to trade councils, the Communist miner delegates to the colliery councils, and the Communist delegates to the workshop councils, were divested of their rank by thousands. Forty-four deputies are to be tried and await their fate in prison, among them some who renounced Stalinism but too late. Nine who are in flight will be charged with treason. Thorez, secretary of the party, already condemned to six years for desertion, and André Marty, who was in Moscow last September, have lost their French nationality. The ironical thing about all this is that only a short time ago the French Communists, with a nationalist and militarist line, were outdoing many conservatives in their orthodoxy.

Communists obeying the orders of Moscow are not the only revolutionaries who are being pursued. Numerous arrests have been made in the so-called Trotskyist groups. These are made up of anti-Stalinite Communists and leftwing Socialists who left the party with Marceau Pivert. They fight Stalinism but also "imperialist war." After a few isolated cases, 16 arrests were made in February in Paris, in narrowly circumscribed Trotskyist circles.

Repression has been directed against Alsatian autonomists, too, but this is a movement fostered by the Nazis. The same may be said of the movement for Breton autonomy, which has no roots in Brittany at all and is only an instrument of disruption encouraged by Hitler. Its protagonists are either in prison or have emigrated to Holland where they have recently been squelched by the authorities.

Pacifists of all tendencies are severely suppressed. In early September the distinguished author, Jean Giono, some of whose recent writings had expressed a categorical refusal of war, was arrested at Manosque (Basses Alpes) where he lives, for having made pacifist statements. He was liberated in December. André Juin,

journalist and artist, contributor to the General Confederation of Labor paper, *Le Peuple,* was sentenced to five years' imprisonment for having edited the twice-monthly organ of the Trade Union Center of Action Against War. George Maupioux and his wife were sentenced to four years for having sent out the paper.

At the beginning of the war, a group of writers and political activists signed a manifesto calling for immediate peace. Among the signatories were Marcel Deat, deputy and former Cabinet Minister; some leaders of the Confédération Générale du Travail, such as Pierre Vigne, secretary of the Miners' Federation; professors and writers, such as Alain, Victor Margueritte, Georges Pioch, Felicien Challaye, Michel Alexandre, Henry Poulaille, Germaine Decaris, and anarchist leaders. The author of the tract, the anarchist Lecoin, and some of his fellowsigners were arrested. During the inquiry most of the signatories testified that they had given Lecoin their signatures on principle in favor of peace should such an event develop, but that their signature was not actual, but rather given by assent to a vague idea over the telephone. Most of the charges were dismissed.

But sentences have been passed for articles published before the war began! And before censorship was established! Fernand Vindringuer, managing editor of the anarchist newspaper, was condemned to 15 months and 10 months respectively for two articles which he himself had not written. Henri Jeanson, a playwright, was sentenced to five years for an article which appeared in the review of the International Anti-Fascist Aid on August 17—seventeen days before the war—which was thought conducive to disobedience on the part of soldiers. For a new twist to his offense, Jeanson later had his sentence amplified by another year and a half.

Conscientious objectors, who are not numerous in France, do not enjoy the tolerance or status accorded them in England. There is, however, a certain tolerance given to those who refuse army service but who accept health service. This tolerance or lack of it depends largely on the individual corps commander. Some war resisters, upon a refusal to bear arms, have been put to work in hospitals. Those who have taken an uncompromising stand have been put in prison. Henri Roser, secretary of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, was sentenced on December 19 to four years behind the bars.

As part of the picture, one must at least mention the inhuman conditions under which the internment of citizens from the enemy country has been carried out. All men between 17 and 55 years of age, of German or Austrian nationality, were interned at the beginning of September, the women being left their liberty. At Paris, 6,000 men were gathered together at the Colombes Open Air Stadium. No distinction was made between Nazis, political refugees, and Jewish emigrés. Later, special commissions got down to sorting them out, and many were freed, provided two French subjects guaranteed their loyalty.

To all of this must be added the extremely serious way in which the censorship has been used, not for military reasons alone, but for political reasons also. By-elections have been suppressed, so that universal suffrage is in abeyance. The full powers given to the government do not require the assent of Parliament. But early in the spring the government announced a sweeping reform in the censorship, which gave hope that conditions would be fairer, freer, and more democratic. But on the other hand, this concession had no sooner been made to libertarian and labor opinion than all labor was put under government control as conscripts of industry.

"Are we still in a democracy?" asked M. Bonnevay, a moderate deputy, in Parliament. In the opinion of many, many uneasy believers in a democratic republic, the defense of civil liberty has been for some time an urgent duty. A group of deputies has been formed at the Chamber, under the name of "Le Groupe Démocratique." It intends to fight against further encroachments by the state on the liberties of the people. It is upon this democratic spirit, which in France always asserts itself when pressed too far, that France's friends must lean. Under fear or stress of necessity the people will abandon their freedom for a time; but the reaction is perhaps more certain in France than anywhere in the world. Democracy is still deeply rooted in the mind of the individual Frenchman, and to keep it down for very long would be—it must be hoped—a task at which success is very doubtful.

When Jew and Christian Meet

ROBERT WHITAKER

On the east side of Los Angeles there is a street which for reasons unknown to me was named for the famous Spanish explorer, Fernando De Soto. On North De Soto Street stands the Grace Methodist Church, with one of the best church plants in the city. To this church there was appointed as pastor, in 1932, the Reverend Dr. Floyd J. Seaman, who was then a little past sixty years of age, and already had a distinguished record of broad service in both the religious and social fields, if these fields may be separated. Dr. Seaman, from the time of his first pastorate, when he was assistant to Dr. Charles McFarland in Topeka, Kansas, realized that a real Christian ministry must needs be a quest for a community life directed toward the realization of the Kingdom of God on earth. The cost of such a ministry he was made to realize then. He did not shrink from the price, but carried on only the more emphatically and the more effectively in what was to prove his final pastorate, during the seven years from 1932 to 1939. He had been transferred to another church in another section of Los Angeles, the Echo Park Church, just a few months before the breakdown which brought his ministry to an end, in his death on April 15, 1940.

That which was notable at his funeral was not only the attendance and participation of his fellow ministers, and public citizens, in recognition of the prominent part he had played in the city's life. More exceptional was the fact that a large body of Jews were present, from the Eastside in Los Angeles, in witness of their high regard for him, and for the great work which he and his wife, Flora Jones Seaman, as notable in her way as himself, had wrought in the Eastside area during the long years of their residence and service there.

It is betraying no secret, so far as the public in Los Angeles is concerned, that the length of that ministry

on De Soto Street, in Grace Church and its environs, was due in no small part to the remarkable response which Jewish friends and supporters had manifested in many ways. It was a human ministry, so broad, so tolerant, and yet so courageous in its support of the social movements at which special privilege looks askance, and so wise in its program, that men and women of every faith, and of no recognized faith at all, answered to it even as the common people answered to the ministry of Jesus.

I had but one Sunday afternoon and evening with them, in their home, and in the pulpit of Grace Church, but it was more indelibly impressed upon me than many a far more extended fellowship has been. There was a supreme restfulness about both Dr. and Mrs. Seaman, the release and refreshment of which I can feel to this hour. It is a rare thing, altogether too rare a thing in either pulpit or pew, to find social intelligence and sacrificial courage associated with fine spiritual perception and response to the things which are the unseen and the eternal. I confess that ordinarily I shrink from the word spiritual, it is so often companion to cant, or at least formalism and moral superficiality. There was both depth and height in the Seaman home, and in the Seaman pulpit. I could associate my experience there with those lines from John G. Whittier:

> Let winds that blow from heaven refresh
> Dear Lord, the languid air;
> And let the weakness of the flesh
> Thy strength of spirit share.

The Eastside Los Angeles area I know well. Therefore I know that my measurement of that ministry is not exaggerated, nor my own warm appreciation of the Jewish population that so abounds there, in this testimony that I bear to them both for their common and uncommon fellowship, both while Dr. Seaman lived to serve that community, and in the Jewish tribute to him when he passed on. Jew and Christian will meet the world over whenever and wherever they are offered like opportunity.

"I never looked into his face but that I wanted to be a better man," said one of the youth, whether Jew or Gentile I know not, but a word that many of both fraternities felt. He was "a Stephen with a shining face," someone said, and it might be added that his face did not cease to shine when the formalists and defenders of the powers that be threw stones at him. From the *Eastside Journal,* edited by a brilliant young Jewish writer, Mr. Al Waxman, comes this utterance:

> We on the Eastside are a jealous lot of people. We begrudge the church now to be headed by Dr. Seaman. One thing we know. Wherever Dr. Seaman will preach he will tell the true story of the relationship between Christianity and democracy. He will teach man that he is his brother's keeper. He will make many personal sacrifices so that this world may be a better place in which to live. We know he would give his very life for this.

Later, this same writer declared that in fact Dr. Seaman did give his life for the people.

The end, or the new beginning as it were better to think of it, came suddenly at the last, hastened in part by a serious automobile accident which he suffered when on his way to our State capital, Sacramento, in the interests of a movement to meet the common need.

The Seamans shared their substance without stint, lived the simple life, and devoted themselves to the labors that fall upon the comparatively few who live mainly for their fellows.

The Old Trade Routes

ROBERT SCOTT KELLERMAN

It is a conceit of mine, derived when or from what source or suggestion I disremember, that in the open, natural, unschooled education of Jesus of Nazareth, he acquired a great deal of information from the unending string of camels, those beasts of burden loaded with silks and dyestuffs, perfumes and spices, and also manufactured goods from Rome and Carthage, and their drivers, passing from east to west and from west to east, an untiring shuttle of commerce, across two continents, through the Holy Land, close to the village of Nazareth where in his youth Jesus lived.

That thread of camels and their drivers, traveling over one of the great trade routes of the world, halted in the evenings at the plain of Esdraelon, there between the mountains that separate Jerusalem and Nazareth, for rest, food, and refreshment for both men and beasts. The drivers relieved the camels of their heavy loads which they had carried all day long, fed them, lighted a campfire, and themselves sat down to their frugal evening meal.

With the eye of my imagination, I seem to see the young lad, "son of man," standing by one of the campfires, observing the camel drivers as they ate, listening to their conversation and, maybe, asking them questions, though I could not hear what he said to them.

Those camel drivers were of all sorts and kinds, of various nationalities, of different religions, dull and active, wise and otherwise, and now and then one of real intelligence and learning, as for example, in later years, Mohammed himself who fathered the Moslem religion. Mohammed, in his younger days, was a camel driver in the old trade routes between the east and the west, and in that humble service he became highly educated. And it is not beyond probability that Jesus acquired at least some of his education from the weather-beaten camel drivers in the old trade routes between Asia and Europe.

And those ancient trade routes were highways not only for material and human commerce and travel, but for troops and armies, ambassadors, princes, and potentates as well. And, also, what was of far more value to the education and culture of mankind, over these same trade routes, there traveled spiritual commerce—religion, learning, government, and news of the world. Those campfires were academies of science, schools of philosophy, colleges of unrest and war, and universities of religion and everyday common human life.

This same varied sort of camel drivers,—messengers and merchants of enlightenment, knowledge, emotion, science, religion, coming from east to west, returning from west to east, halting in every city marketplace which they passed through—those camel drivers were destined to carry, and did later truly carry, the story of Jesus of Nazareth

and the re-awakenment of religion in the bosom of his countrymen far and wide, from east to west and west to east. They carried the story of the Galilean to faraway distant India in the east, where a legend lingers still, I am told, of a young teacher from the west who visited and spoke to them. And they carried this same news west to the city of Rome on the Tiber river in Italy, where arose a Christian church, a church without a pastor, sheep without a shepherd, which awaited the coming of St. Paul in chains, "prisoner of the Lord," to be judged of, and to be executed for, his allegiance to Jesus of Nazareth.

The richest, the most precious, the most enduring, the most uplifting and sustaining merchandise ever carried over those well-worn old trade routes was the merchandise of religion, and, most particularly, the merchandise of the spiritual religion of Jesus of Nazareth.

Those ancient trade routes stretching thousands of miles east to west and west to east, binding the Occident to the Orient, with their hundreds of thousands of camels and camel drivers through the passing centuries, were the forerunners and the prophecies of the pony express carriers, the railroads, post office, telegraph, telephone, and radios of this our day, which are the nerves, the blood vessels, the seeing eye, the hearing ear, and the understanding heart, that run through the nations of the earth and bind them together into one great human race of the same origin and of the same destiny.

And during these last eighteen hundred years the Christian Church has been the trade route, the world highway, the "New Way," over which has been carried the spiritual wealth and riches of such a life as that of Jesus, the most alluring, appealing, and beautiful life that has ever been lived on the earth. And there has been transported also over this highway of the Church his clarion call to all the nations of the earth for a life of peace and good will among all the nations of the world; freedom, justice, mercy, and love among all men. And since it is so, I pledge anew my old allegiance to the Christian Church—its worship, its ministrations, its consolations, reproofs, and constant encouragements—and above all to its founder, leader and eternal guarantor, Jesus of Nazareth.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention. *Editor.*]

XVI

In the New York *Times* appears the following:

A condemnation of war as unchristian was voted at the opening sessions of the annual New York East Conference of the Methodist Church despite objection that such a move in the present world situation would appear to put the conference on record in opposition to Allied attempts to halt aggression.

The resolution said that "we reaffirm our previously declared conviction that war is inconsistent with the spirit of Jesus and the kingdom of God, and we recommit ourselves to the task of finding moral and spiritual substitutes for the methods of war."

Another resolution pledged support to "our Methodist young people who in the light of their Christian conviction have determined to stand as conscientious objectors to war."

The New York *Herald-Tribune* reports the keynote speech of the Reverend Elmer A. Fridell, at the opening session in Atlantic City of the Northern Baptist Convention:

Doctor Fridell said that "all freedom will be taken from us" if present war trends continue, and he urged the convention to take a positive stand against anything that makes for war.

The *Christian Century* publishes the following report from New York:

The International Justice and Good Will Commission of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, of which the Reverend John Paul Jones of Union Church is chairman, passed a strong statement which was sent immediately to every minister in the borough. Some striking sentences follow:

"Nations at war do not respect human rights of belligerents or neutrals, of soldiers or civilians, if such respect deprives those nations of advantages without which they believe they cannot win. . . . Shall we be naive enough to believe that there shall never be a day of reckoning for England? American sympathies are with the Allies. America cannot sympathize with Nazi Germany. Hitler's aims, however we may understand their origin, are repugnant to us. But all of this gives us no authority to abrogate the destiny of any nation which puts its trust in the arbitraments of war. . . . We do not believe that civilization will die if Germany is victorious. Neither do we believe that civilization will be saved if the Allies are victorious . . . we reaffirm our conviction that it would be a tragedy of the first magnitude if either side should achieve a crushing victory over the other. We hope and pray that the intensity of the conflict in the present hour will convince Europe's principal antagonists that neither can destroy the other without inflicting destruction upon itself. . . . To this end we urge that our churches appeal to the President and the Congress to lay less stress upon the further military preparedness of our own country, and to show greater concern that the war in Europe be brought to a close. . . . Finally, we urge the churches to call upon the American people to show compassion without rancor or partiality to the sufferers of war in Europe, and indeed to the war sufferers all over the world."

The Massachusetts Methodist Conference, meeting at Westfield, denounced aggression and the war system, and appointed a committee to stand by conscientious objectors.

The New York *Times* publishes the following:

Baptized or confirmed members of the Lutheran Church, "who feel unwilling for conscience' sake to take human life in war," may record their convictions as conscientious objectors in a register which will be set up in the near future by the United Synod of New York through its committee of social missions.

The registry was suggested in a resolution offered yesterday by the Reverend Arnold F. Keller, president of the Central Conference and pastor of the Church of the Redeemer in Utica, and adopted unanimously by church members at the second-day session of the twelfth annual convention of the United Lutheran Synod of New York at St. John's Church.

Mr. Keller said that the Lutheran Church had always recognized the right of freedom of conscience and that the conscientious objectors could serve their country as noncombatants.

The following dispatch from London appeared in the

New York *Herald-Tribune*:

> Lord Ponsonby, former leader of the Labor party in the House of Lords and Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the first Labor government, resigned from the Labor Party today.
>
> Lord Ponsonby has been an ardent advocate of pacifism, and several times has disagreed with the Labor Party's foreign policy. He supported Neville Chamberlain's pre-war appeasement policy.

As the Labor Party is supporting the coalition war ministry of Winston Churchill, the significance of Lord Ponsonby's action is obvious.

The *War Resister* (London) reports the following:

> The Peace Pledge Union has gone steadily ahead since the outbreak of war and nearly 8,000 new members have signed the Pledge. A few have resigned, but the net total membership today is 137,140. The number of groups has also increased and the general experience is that group meetings have been much better attended and that members are showing increased enthusiasm and renewed activity. Similarly, public meetings have attracted good audiences who listen to the pacifist case with, as the bulk of the questions show, a keen desire to find some alternative to the war, which wins neither their enthusiasm nor their approval.

The *Christian Century* Detroit correspondent reports the following items of news from that city:

> Speaking in Central Methodist Church, the Reverend Henry Hitt Crane took for his theme, "What on Earth Is God Doing?" He said: "God used the cruelty of mankind to redeem mankind. Through the cruel crucifixion of Christ, mankind was saved. Men think they get away with evil, but their sins find them out even if they do not find out their sins." Doctor Crane considers the war as "retribution for the selfishness, greed, injustice, and cruelty that have characterized every nation."
>
> On Mother's Day, 3,000 men, women, and children, with flags and banners, paraded through the main streets of the city in behalf of peace and against America's participation in the war.

The students of Yale Divinity School telegraphed the President: "We regret your alarmist speech to Congress, and as future ministers will oppose such unwarranted expenditures for a war machine. We hope that in the future you will not invoke the name of God to support such militarism."

At Yale, over 1500 undergraduates and students in the law and divinity schools signed a petition addressed to the President asking that the United States should "grant no credit, give no supplies, and send no men" to the forces now struggling in Europe. Specifying that the signers are of military age, the petition urges that the United States should stay out of the war.

At Dartmouth, a letter signed by 1,008 undergraduates was sent to the President stating that the signatories wanted no part in Europe's conflict. Said the letter:

> We do not believe that the present European war can be simplified into a conflict between good and evil, construction and destruction, as you have indicated. And we do not believe, as you imply, that American entrance into the war may be necessary to preserve "our culture, our freedom, and our civilization."

At Harvard, an anti-war petition signed by hundreds of students was bitterly attacked by Prof. Roger B. Merriman, of the history department, who complained that students "totally fail to see the moral issue" involved.

The Eleventh Annual Conference of the War Resisters League, held at Bound Brook, New Jersey, adopted two resolutions, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. I

War has proved itself a failure as a means of solving human problems. Victory has proved itself a failure as a means to peace, as the history of wars, including the last one, has shown.

War has proved itself a ghastly costly massacre of human beings and nothing else. War is a product of all systems of human exploitation, represented in its most aggravated form by present-day imperialism and totalitarian Fascism and Communism. It is a means of taking from the peoples of the world their freedom, their goods, and their lives.

Press, President, and other politicians are doing all in their power at this time to create mass hysteria and mass fear in the minds of the American people. The present crisis is the logical and expected outcome of the events of the past years and of the failure of governments to solve the problems that beset the world. These problems cannot be solved through war, but only through peaceful, constructive action.

Therefore, we War Resisters renounce all war, now and forever. We are determined not to support any kind of war, international or civil, and to strive for the removal of all the causes of war.

Therefore we urge upon the peoples and the government of the United States that they—

(1) Take every possible action to end the present war in Europe by working to set up a central mediation commission, and by offering our active aid in establishing a world federation and in any other way that may contribute to a genuine peace.

(2) Emphasize to the world our unalterable determination to remain out of the present conflict, thus avoiding conscription and the abrogation of our civil liberties.

(3) Strive to reduce, not increase, our already overlarge armaments and take effective steps toward international disarmament.

(4) Immediately amend the Constitution to permit the people who will have to fight wars to vote upon the question of having them.

(5) Strive to remove tariffs and other barriers to the free international flow of goods and people and to effect an equitable distribution of the world's wealth.

(6) Strive to solve the problems of unemployment and poverty here.

(7) Support ban on export of all war materials and restrict export to belligerents to a quota based on average peacetime purchases.

RESOLUTION No. II

The Conference calls on all members and supporters of the War Resisters League to *take part in the following program of action*:

1. *Join* with fellow pacifists in their neighborhood or city in local groups for consultation, solidarity and joint action. Meetings should be held frequently. Each pacifist should devote six or more hours a week to our cause at this critical time.

2. *Send* at least two letters a week to either the President, Senators or Congressmen or local editor expressing our views on why America should stay out of the war and participate in constructive efforts for a lasting peace.

3. *Circulate The Conscientious Objector* and other pacifist literature to friends, relatives, fellow workers and students and to those we meet in churches and fraternal organizations.

4. *Participate* in movements that strive for greater civil liberties, tolerance, interracial harmony, and the solution of the problems of unemployment and poverty.

5. *Coöperate* with the Keep America Out of War Congress in attempting to organize those opposed to American entry into war.

6. *Circulate* petitions in order to mobilize additional sentiment for keeping America Out of War.

The Voices

I stepped into the garden night-air
And rode uplifted on the sound
Of music, music floating everywhere.
At last did the world's burden seem unbound.

Bitter deception: wars and winter
Still gripped each fearful living thing;
People were listening to the Radio
Because they had no heart themselves to sing.

GEOFFREY JOHNSON.

The Study Table

A Vivid Defense of Democracy

SUFFERANCE IS THE BADGE. *By Abram Leon Sachar. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.* $3.50.

This book is a vivid defense of democracy, a history of Europe since 1918 and a history of the Jews around the world during that same period. It is as fascinating a book as one can come across in a year's reading. I can say that, having just read *In Place of Splendor.* Both books hold one spellbound.

Events have moved so rapidly in Europe that much of the book had to be rewritten four times. When he finally had to send off the manuscript there was not much light in the sky but the author does note one very significant gleam:

> During the months of writing and revision the gloom has deepened. Yet one hopeful factor remains to keep the heart whole—the growing conviction of responsible Christian leadership that the assault on Jewish life is merely the opening wedge for the assault on liberalism and religion, on labor and their living standards, on reason and the scientific spirit. It began cunningly as anti-Semitism, but ultimately, as Chamberlain, Daladier, and even the Polish Colonel Beck have learned, it threatened all civilized values. Hence the Jews, a tiny, scattered, harried people, are not fighting alone. Their destiny is bound up with the fate of the democratic dogma. If the liberal spirit survives its present crucial ordeal, if reason stems the onrush of the forces of barbarism, the Jewish minority will also come through to share the privileges and the responsibilities of the brave new world tomorrow.

And he concludes at the end of a long tragic story, "History is on the side of the optimists."

Dr. Sachar has a sense of humor that compels him every few pages to put in a story that illuminates the tragedy. When President Wilson appointed Mr. Brandeis to the Supreme Court his nomination was bitterly opposed, not because he was a Jew, but because he was a radical. Among the signers of a petition to the Senate urging that the appointment be denied was the name of William Howard Taft. Now for the story:

> One day, several years after his appointment, Brandeis was out taking his regular evening stroll just before dinner, which is served punctually at seven. It was a rainy, misty evening, and he was hurrying back to his home when, in turning a corner, he bumped into a large portly gentleman, also walking rapidly. Brandeis looked up, but before he could say anything the other man held out his hand and said: "Isn't this Mr. Brandeis? I am Mr. Taft. I once did you a great injustice, Mr. Brandeis. I am sorry."
>
> "Thank you, Mr. Taft."
>
> "Good night, Mr. Brandeis."
>
> "Good night, Mr. Taft."

Dr. Sachar is a well-trained historian having taken his doctorate in Cambridge, and before taking over the directorship of the Hillel Foundations, he was a professor of history at the University of Illinois. He shows an amazing knowledge of every country of which he writes. He tells this dramatic story of the past twenty years with vivid color, and remarkable objectivity and truth.

What a challenge to every Christian is this sentence which follows his story of Jewish help for fellow sufferers overseas: "Every Jew with a social conscience learned each year what it meant to be his 'brother's keeper'."

If you are interested in the struggle going on in Palestine—or if you think you are not interested—you will find Dr. Sachar's two chapters on that unhappy country as exciting and as stimulating as anything in any modern book.

If you want a thumbnail sketch of some of the countries about which most of us know very little, read his chapters "Rumania: Beggar on Horseback" or "Hungary: Magyar Memory Is Long."

His chapter on "Austria: Farewell" is one of the saddest stories in literature. It is written with rare delicacy and a charm that makes it equal to the great memorial tributes of all time. It is a funeral piece.

This is a dark age for democracy, for the Jews, for civilization itself. But at the end, after more than 500 pages of tragedy and suffering and heartache, Dr. Sachar still has "faith that mankind has the capacity to conquer the forces of darkness." We all must believe that—but in order to conquer, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews must understand each other and coöperate. History proves that that is not easy—but in the United States we are slowly learning to do it.

JAMES M. YARD.

America's Unforgettable Philosopher

JONATHAN EDWARDS. *By Ola Elizabeth Winslow. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $3.50.

The world can never forget Jonathan Edwards, minister of the church, philosopher, and mystic. Wundt, the great Leipzig psychologist, used to tell his students that Jonathan Edwards is the greatest man America ever produced. History may honor this verdict. One of the great tragedies for the cultural history of America is the fact that Edwards died at the early age of fifty-five. Had he been permitted to carry on the presidency of Princeton, the world would have been enriched by his books and by his students. There is meaning in every biography of Edwards. His lifetime is the story of the first half of the eighteenth century. A son of the Puritans, he went beyond them. There was enough of the tragic in his story to make it perennially worth retelling. Miss Winslow has attempted to go back to certain unused manuscript sources, to make her biography as far as possible autobiographical. She believes that the year 1740 "marks an end and a beginning" in America's religious and cultural life. "The Great Awakening was an upheaval." So it was. The result of his observation on all this made Edwards the first psychologist of religion as well as a great philosophical investigator. And let it be noted that no man has ever disproved Edwards' thesis. Epithets and abuse have been hurled at him, but these disprove nothing. As a missionary to the Indians he found time to write, and his permanent contribution lies in what he wrote, not in the Indians whom he taught. While in Stockbridge, his work was related to that of another missionary family, the Sergeants, whose story ought also to be written. Miss Winslow's biography will be read by all who are interested in the cultural history of America; it will find its way into libraries and will be consulted with profit by biographers in the future, for Edwards will always attract writers who will retell his story.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

The Lunch-Counter Girl

Editor of UNITY:

I am hoping some time to find that lunch counter (April 15 issue of UNITY) and perhaps have a peep at your bewitching girl, sans paint, powder, lipstick, with uncut, uncurled hair tracing the lovely outlines of her head and throat, and—wearing a hat with a bit of fur *after Easter!* An unspoiled girl, far from the entanglement of modern artificiality—an alluring picture, much appreciated and enjoyed as I read your account. But why conclude that the use of the ordinary embellishments (so-called) to women's charm means an inferiority complex on the part of the other girls, to whom we concede this one is a refreshing exception?

Could you, Mr. Editor, by any chance have been so occupied with this pleasing and unusual sight as to have missed a heart-beat and leaned too far from the seat of logic? Let us examine this possibility. Putting your conclusions in your own logical way of a one, two, and three:

Conclusion one: "Not an artificial touch upon her." Have you not known, Sir, have you not heard, that in women's make-up and dress the essence of art is the achievement of just that artlessness which so moved you? I would venture to offer the assumption that this girl's beauty parlor bills for a month would exceed her more obviously decorated sister's wages for several times that period, if you should add the bill for the simple little hat with the bit of fur! Lack of art may be crude, but accomplished art bears the subtle perfection you so enjoyed.

Conclusion two: "She defied seasons and ignored fashions, and remained her unspoiled self." We are partly in agreement here, but in view of the preceding remarks under conclusion one, would you concede the change from "unspoiled" to "perfected"? Being a finished product according to her own standards, her mind was at rest; she could afford to be unaware of the rest of the female world.

Conclusion three: "All the painting and powdering, the clipping and curling of our day spring from an inferiority complex in modern women." Entire disagreement, with your pardon, Sir! Will you stand for ten minutes in a five and ten cent store, before a counter where a new shade of lipstick or rouge (perhaps the modern chain store "combination" of the two) is being demonstrated? If you can get near enough, watch and listen. Can you detect the slightest evidence of an inferiority complex, of being "demoralized" or "frightened," in these girls watching with critical eye, and when the demonstration is over buying with a dime (probably saved on lunch) this latest aid to beauty? With no slightest consideration of whether or not it becomes them, if it is the *newest thing,* to them it is perfection.

No, Mr. Editor, not an inferiority complex—just a difference in standards. Your lunch-counter girl had somehow become possessed of standards of art, she had been trained to know the difference between art and fad. To those other girls her perfection would be "odd," just not having the latest thing, the crime of all crimes! It might possibly be that the lunch-counter girl had background enough to be herself consciously making her apparel cover a secret terror in her own heart. She is the one who would be the type to have values and desires that might lead to an inferiority complex, to that demoralization and fright which you attribute to her less artistic sisters. But no inferiority complex for the painting, powdering, curling kind. Most of them, we suspect, have never been introduced to real standards—perhaps that very lack lends them their confidence. Superiority, to them, is being like everyone else. They follow the crowd, not knowing why or why not. And after all—they are gallant and gay, they know their world and refuse to flinch. Perhaps an inferiority sense comes with the passing of the years, but that would be another matter. Your lunch-counter girl, we take it, was young.

What's the matter, you ask? Not an inferiority complex, but lack of standards.

New York, N. Y.

ETHEL G. ROCKWELL.

A Parable for These Times

Editor of UNITY:

As we witness our world being destroyed under our very eyes, this thought comes to me:

We have failed (as a civilization) in this term of our elementary school, and our Teacher bids us go back again, over the same lessons, until we master them thoroughly and are fit to move on to the next grade—which, in terms of humanity, will be the next civilization.

Therefore, we must all put on our dunce caps and ultimately disappear from the scene of the present. On the blackboard the Teacher makes us write, over and over, the following:

> Before I can be promoted, I must learn to study the lessons my Teacher has outlined for me, and apply them every day of my life. I will always stay back, I will always be *put* back, until I learn to pay attention to one of the biggest problems in my school book—"Thou shalt not kill."

P. S.—Dear Teacher—I'm awfully tired. How many more times do I have to go over this lesson. It seems to me I've gone over it at least a hundred times. When will I ever get promoted?

Rochester, New York HENRIETTA POSNER.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 114)

an act of greed and heartless covetousness. The victorious troop with their enormous booty quickly returned to the brook, Besor, where the 200 that had broken down on the rapid march had been left to guard the baggage. David saluted them with kindly courtesy but the 400 who had actually taken part in the fight refused to share the booty with their comrades who had been left behind except to restore to them their wives and those things of their own which had been recovered from the Amalekites. David, however, refused to listen to their iniquitous claims, and decided that all the fighting part of the force, and those men who had stayed behind and guarded the baggage at the brook, Besor, should share alike.

I am reminded of those beautiful lines from Milton's Sonnet XIX, "In the Heavenly Church of God"—

> His state
> Is kingly; thousands at his bidding speed,
> And post o'er land and ocean without rest;
> They also serve who only stand and wait.

And in another of his Sonnets—

> Peace hath her victories
> No less renowned than war: new foes arise,
> Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains.
> Help us to save free conscience from the paw
> Of hireling wolves, whose Gospel is their maw.

I submit that we have divine approval for the tribute of our hearts to those whose lives we here commemorate; and may God hasten the time of world-wide brotherhood and peace.

Keep Out of This War

National Council for Prevention of War suggests the following action on the part of all who want to keep the United States out of war:

1. To every person you meet, say you believe the United States should keep out of this war, and say why.

2. Write five letters, one to the President, one to the Secretary of State, one each to your two Senators and one to your own Congressman. Write five more next week.

3. Persuade other individuals to write similar letters.

4. Write "letters to the editor" for publication.

5. Talk to your local editors; go to see them yourself or arrange for a group of people to see them.

6. Ask your minister to help keep this country out of war for the sake of the future of the world. What is said in the churches exerts a tremendous influence on public opinion and also through quotation in the press and otherwise becomes known to those who are determining policy.

7. Ask a group of your neighbors and friends to meet at your house to talk things over and write letters to those suggested above. If you cannot get men and women—get women. In many towns mothers and other women are organizing against war.

8. Let it be known that you will refuse to vote for any candidate for Congress in the coming campaign who does not pledge himself unequivocally to keep this country out of war.